1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 1	
	LAWRENCE & LAWRENCE LAW, PLLC
	Nathan E. Lawrence, NBN 15060
	Joseph P. Lawrence, NBN 16726
	9480 S. Eastern Ave., Ste. 213
	Las Vegas, Nevada 89123
	Telephone: 702-534-6556
	Facsimile: 702-602-5168
	nathan@law2esq.com
	joseph@law2esq.com
١	Attorneys for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

JAIYAUNA RAYSHAWN YOAKUM, an individual; and JOHNTOVIA PRESTON, an individual; collectively,

Plaintiffs,

v.

HOBBY LOBBY STORES, INC., a foreign corporation; PETEFISH GENE PETEFISH, an individual; and DOES I to X, inclusive; collectively,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:23-cv-01740-APG-DJA

STIPULATION AND ORDER TO EXTEND DEADLINE FOR PLAINTIFFS TO FILE RESPONSES TO **DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS FOR** PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT [ECF Nos. 39 and 40] and FOR **DEFENDANTS' REPLIES THERETO**

(First Request)

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. ("FRCP) 6(b)(1) and Local Rules IA 6-1 and IA 6-2, Plaintiffs JAIYAUNA RAYSHAWN YOAKUM and JOHNTOVIA PRESTON, by and through their attorneys of the law firm of LAWRENCE & LAWRENCE LAW, PLLC, and Defendants HOBBY LOBBY STORES, INC. and PETEFISH GENE PETEFISH, by and through their attorneys of the law firm of OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK & STEWART, P.C., hereby submit this Stipulation and Order to Extend the Deadline for Plaintiffs to File Responses to Defendants' Motions for Partial Summary Judgment [ECF Nos. 39 and 40].

This is the first stipulation to extend the indicated deadline following the filing by the Defendants of their respective motions on May 21, 2025, and this stipulation is presented to the



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

Court in advance of the current deadline of June 11, 2025. For the foregoing reasons and as is more fully explicated below, the Parties stipulate to and respectfully request that this Court extend the noted deadlines. This request for extension is made in good faith and not for the purpose of delay.

I. LEGAL STANDARD

Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 6(b)(1) governs extensions of time and allows, in relevant part, that "[w]hen an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may, for good cause, extend the time: (A) with or without motion or notice if the court acts, or if a request is made, before the original time or its extension expires." If additional time for any purpose is needed, the proper procedure is to present a request for extension of time before the time fixed has expired. Canup v. Mississippi Val. Barge Line Co., 31 F.R.D. 282 (W.D. Pa. 1962). An extension of time may always be sought and is usually granted on a showing of good cause if timely made under subdivision (b)(1) of [FRCP 6]. Creedon v. Taubman, 8 F.R.D. 268 (N.D. Ohio 1947). Also, a district court possesses the inherent power to control its own docket. Hamilton Copper & Steel Corp. v. Primary Steel, Inc., 898 F.2d 1428, 1429 (9th Cir. 1990); Olivia v. Sullivan, 958 F.2d 272, 273 (9th Cir. 1992).

LR IA 6-1 additionally requires that a motion to extend time must state the reasons for the extension requested and will not be granted if requested after the expiration of the specified period unless the movant demonstrates that the failure to file the motion before the deadline expired resulted because of excusable neglect. LR 26-3 requires that a motion to extend any date set by the discovery plan, scheduling order, or other order must, as well as satisfying the requirements of LR IA 6-1, demonstrate good cause for the extension.

II. ARGUMENT

Plaintiffs' counsel has been actively working to timely complete the response to the pending motions, however, a brief extension has become necessary. During the initial response period, Plaintiff's counsel was out of the country for eight days on a previously scheduled and unavoidable trip, during which trip Plaintiffs' counsel unfortunately suffered a dislocated left middle finger and broken middle metacarpal, which injury and treatment therefor have created



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

some difficulties and delays following counsel's return to the country. The parties stipulate that each of the noted events constitute good cause for the requested extension.

Accordingly, the parties stipulate that the time for Plaintiffs to file their response to Defendants pending Motions for Partial Summary Judgment should be extended from June 11, 2025, to June 20, 2025. Defendants' Reply brief deadline should therefore be extended to Monday, July 14, 2025.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

DATED this 9th day of June 2025.

LAWRENCE & LAWRENCE LAW,

PLLC

Nathan E. Lawrence, NBN 15060 Joseph P. Lawrence, NBN 16726 9480 S. Eastern Ave., Ste. 213 Las Vegas, Nevada 89123 Telephone: 702-534-6556

Facsimile: 702-602-5168 nathan@law2esq.com joseph@law2esq.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs

DATED this 9th day of June 2025.

OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK & STEWART, P.C.

/s/ Noel M. Hernandez

Molly M. Rezac, NBN 7435

Kathryn C. Newman

Noel M. Hernandez

Attorneys for Defendants Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc. & Petefish Gene Petefish

IT IS SO ORDERED.

ANDREW P. GORDON

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

DATED: June 10, 2025

